



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,113	08/28/2003	Aveek Sarkar	188184/US	7868
66083	7590	12/13/2007	EXAMINER	
SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. c/o DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP 370 SEVENTEENTH ST. SUITE 4700 DENVER, CO 80202			SANDOVAL, PATRICK	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2825		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/651,113	SARKAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Patrick Sandoval	2825

All Participants:

Status of Application: Final Rejection

(1) Patrick Sandoval.

(3) Greg Durban - Registration No. 42,503.

(2) John Ketchum.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 December 2007

Time: 3pm and 5pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

1-16, 18-28, 30-34, 36-42

Claims discussed:

Independent claim 1 and similar independent claims 12, 22, 30 and 37

Prior art documents discussed:

US Patent 7,149,991 - Kovacs-Birkas et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representatives spoke w/ Examiner Sandoval to discuss proposed Amendments, which were faxed in to Examiner Sandoval on December 6, 2007. It was concluded between participants that the proposed Amendments were not sufficient to overcome previous prior art rejections.



Patrick Sandoval
Art Unit 2825
(571)272-7973



JACK CHIANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER